is the second se	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/924,476	KIKUGAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John P. Sheehan	1742
All Participants: Status of Application: Amended		
(1) <u>John P. Sheehan</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. William brooks</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 7 December 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 1 and 2		
Prior art documents discussed: Chinese Patent Document No. 1259754A		
Part II.	·	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	AL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writtened of the substance of the i	n summary of the substance interview, since the interview
Int (20.0		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/A	Applicant's Representative Sig	nature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner requested authority for an Examiner's Amendent to delete the new claim language, "wherein there is no aluminum film provided between the surface of the magnet and the chemical conversion film" (claim 1, the last 2 lines) so as to avoid the issue of new matter and to add the subject matter of claim 2 to claim 1 so as to avoid a rejection in view of Chinese Patent Document No. 1259754A cited in the IDS submitted June 22, 2004...